



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Scholars will probably accept at least these negative conclusions of the writer, who speaks with authority and conviction. His new theory, however, as to the origin of these monuments will hardly at once command assent: he suggests that these sculptures are the work of the northern people (of which the Philistines formed a branch) driven back from the Egyptian frontier by Rameses III in 1107, and his suggestion is sustained both by chronological considerations and by the stylistic features of the monuments. But, before a definitive conclusion can be reached as to this point, it will be necessary to decipher the inscriptions. Though not a little remains to be done, this much at least may now be positively asserted—the “Hittite” monuments are not the work of the “Cheta.”—F. DÜMLER, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 25.

RABOISSON. *Description géographique des anciens empires d'Assyrie d'après les documents cunéiforms. I. Tiglath Pileser I.* 8vo, pp. 84. Paris, 1890; Écoles d'Orient.

The idea of the author—of giving the geography of the various lands conquered by the several Assyrian kings according to the inscriptions of each reign—is excellent; but this is the only point for which the book can be commended. To carry such an idea into practice requires a knowledge of Assyrian and a first-hand study of the inscriptions. Menant's “translations” can by no means be accepted as a satisfactory substitute. The author shows a vicious tendency to identify names that have a similar sound, and takes much satisfaction in his *données homotopologiques et conditions isophoniques*, fair-sounding words that do not relieve the book of its diletante character.—H. WINCKLER, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 52.

CLASSICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

MAX BENCKER. *Der Antheil der Periegesis an der Kunstschriftstellerei der Alten.* 8vo, pp. vi, 71. Munich, 1890; F. Straub. 1.80 Mark.

This well-written and sensible book opens with an account of the literary activity of Diodoros, Polemon, Heliodoros, the only persons expressly termed *περιηγηταί* in antiquity. Thus is obtained a basis for the enquiry (in ch. II) as to the significance of the *περιήγησις* in general; in ch. III the place occupied in this class of writings by the *περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος* of Pausanias is defined. The results of the investigation are summarised as follows: “*Periegesis* is a branch of what the ancients called *γραμματική*, wherein objects of antiquarian interest were described and discussed in and according to their geographical connection. Originally it had nothing to do with the literature of art and with art-history, but it came to cross them from the fact that all dealt in part with the same subjects. . . . In attempting to form

a conception of the *periegesis* of Polemon, the most important representative of this branch of literature, the *periegesis* of Pausanias must be used with great caution. . . . Direct proofs are lacking of dependence of Pausanias upon Polemon ; indeed, internal evidence tells against such a relation." The author, in spite of the general soundness of his views, has made several erroneous statements, and has treated parts of his subject inadequately. Heliodoros cannot be regarded as an "imitator" of Polemon. In the list of *periegetai* should be inserted the names of Theophilos (Sicily), Antigonos (Macedonia), and Asklepiades (τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ Τουρδιτανίᾳ). In describing objects of antiquarian interest the *periegetai* cannot always have taken them up in succession according to their geographic or topographic location. How could such an order have been followed, for example, in Anaxandridas' περὶ τῶν συληθέντων ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀναθημάτων, which dealt with lost ex-votos?—W. GURLITT, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 1.

R. CAGNAT. *L'Année épigraphique* (1889). Paris, 1890 ; Leroux.

It was a happy thought that led M. Cagnat to publish first in the *Revue Archéologique*, and afterwards in an annual reprint, the Latin inscriptions that are from time to time discovered in what was the ancient Roman world. This, the second fasciculus (for 1889), is no less interesting than that of 1888 ; it contains 188 new inscriptions, many of which are of signal importance. On pp. 53 and 54 is given a plan of the barracks of the Vigiles lately excavated at Ostia. True to his programme, M. Cagnat furnishes, with his texts and notes, a bibliography of new books and articles on Roman Epigraphy and Institutions ; this, with his excellent indexes, greatly enhances the value of a publication which is almost indispensable for students of the Latin language and of Roman history and institutions.—P. GUIRAUD, in *Rev. Critique*, 1891, No. 26.

A. CARTAULT. *Terres Cuites Grecques photographiées d'après les originaux des collections privées de France et des musées d'Athènes.*

Large 4to, pp. LVII, 97 ; 29 plates. Paris, 1891 ; Colin.

After an introduction on Greek and Italic terracottas, the author describes forty-three examples, which are figured on twenty-nine inferior plates. Of these forty-three examples only three, according to the reviewer, are of unquestioned genuineness, being from Athens, Corinth and Megara respectively. Of the others, many are without question spurious and belong to the class known as "Asia Minor" terracottas (*cf. Rev. Critique*, 1890, I, p. 41), and nine have already been adequately published. The author is familiar with current literature on the subject, as is in part shown by his propounding as his own the views of other scholars, but he wholly lacks the originality that he affects. His æsthetic criticisms are vulgar and of little